# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/974,982 | 10/11/2001 | Kenneth Ray Banning | AUS920010691US1 | 8110 |

| 44994 | 7590 | 12/21/2004 |
|---|---|---|

IBM CORPORATION (DWL)
C/O LALLY & LALLY, L.L.P.
P. O. BOX 684749
AUSTIN, TX 78768-4749

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2155 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | | 09/974,982 | BANNING ET AL. |
| | | **Examiner** | **Art Unit** | |
| | | Victor Lesniewski | 2155 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11 October 2001_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      This application has been examined.

2.      Claims 1-27 are now pending.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.      Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Hoff

(U.S. Patent Number 6,381,631) in view of Fernandez et al., "An Abstract Authorization System

for the Internet," hereinafter referred to as Fernandez.

5.      van Hoff disclosed a method for allowing a user to access information on a remote

network and on third party networks that he has permission to access.  In an analogous art,

Fernandez disclosed an authorization model for hypertext documents that allows implementation

of role-based access control.

6.      Concerning claims 1, 10, and 19, van Hoff did not explicitly state that his system initially

determines whether the requested document is context restricted and did not explicitly state the

ability to return differing versions to the client.  However, Fernandez describes in detail the

process by which authorization rules are set up for a file access system, thus explicitly showing

how a determination is made as to whether a requested document is context restricted.

Furthermore, Fernandez's system explicitly states the use of versioning whereby different levels

of access may result in the return of different versions to the user. Since the inventions

encompass the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of van Hoff by adding the ability

to determine whether the requested document is context restricted and the ability to return

differing versions to the client as provided by Fernandez. Here, the combination satisfies the

need for more advanced authorization policies that can be used to restrict access to documents

based on a wider array of concepts or roles. See Fernandez, section 1, paragraph 2. This

rationale also applies to those dependent claims utilizing the same combination.

7.      Some claims will be discussed together. Those claims which are essentially the same

except that they set forth the claimed invention as a computer program product or a server are

rejected under the same rationale applied to the described claim.

8.      Thereby, the combination of van Hoff and Fernandez discloses:

- <Claims 1, 10, and 19>

  A method of processing a client request for a document from a server in a data processing

  network, comprising: determining whether the requested document is context restricted

  (Fernandez, section 4.1); responsive to determining that the requested document is

  context restricted, determining whether the client has access authority to the requested

  document (van Hoff, column 5, lines 5-28 and column 6, lines 7-17); and responsive to

  determining that the client lacks access authority, responding to the client request by

  returning a version of the requested document that differs from a version returned to a

  client having access authority (Fernandez, section 3, paragraph 3 "This object model...").

- <Claims 2, 11, and 20>

  The method of claim 1, wherein determining whether the client has access authority includes determining whether the client has direct access authority (van Hoff, column 6, lines 25-30).

- <Claims 3, 12, and 21>

  The method of claim 2, wherein the client request comprises an HTTP formatted request and further wherein determining whether the client has direct access authority includes comparing state information contained in the request to a predetermined value (van Hoff, column 6, lines 42-53).

- <Claims 4, 13, and 22>

  The method of claim 3, wherein the state information required to acquire direct access authority is sent to the client when the client views a document or set of documents that provide the required context for the requested document (van Hoff, column 6, lines 31-41).

- <Claims 5, 14, and 23>

  The method of claim 1, wherein determining whether the client has access authority includes determining whether the client has indirect access authority (van Hoff, column 8, lines 34-40).

- <Claims 6, 15, and 24>

  The method of claim 5, wherein the client request comprises an HTTP formatted request and further wherein determining whether the client has indirect access authority includes

determining whether the client has been referred to the requested document by a third

party server (van Hoff, column 8, lines 40-48).

- <Claims 7, 16, and 25>

  The method of claim 6, wherein determining whether the client has been referred by a

  third party server comprises determining whether the value of a request header field in

  the client request matches at least one entry in a table of authorized referrers  (van Hoff,

  column 8, lines 49-56).

- <Claims 8, 17, and 26>

  The method of claim 7, wherein the request header field comprises a referrer header field

  of an HTTP request and wherein the table of authorized referrers is stored permanent

  storage to which the server has access (van Hoff, column 8, line 65 through column 9,

  line 1).

- <Claims 9, 18, and 27>

  The method of claim 1, wherein returning a version of the requested document that

  differs includes retrieving the requested document and running an application to insert a

  visibly detectable notice indicating that the requested document is being viewed out of

  context (Fernandez, section 5, paragraphs 3 and 4 "Each web server…by extending its

  authorization system").

Since the combination of van Hoff and Fernandez discloses all of the above limitations, claims 1-

27 are rejected.

## *Conclusion*

9.      The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's

disclosure.

- Liu et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,898,780) disclosed a method for allowing a user to

    access the Internet from a remote location by using a local Internet service provider with

    whom the user does not have an account.

- Vahalia et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,192,408) disclosed a network file server with

    functionality to receive requests from clients and access read-write file systems.

- Sampson et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,339,423) disclosed an access control system that

    manages access by users to resources in multiple domains.

- Hunt et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,496,855) disclosed a website registration proxy system

    that allows users to move between registered sites via a single interface.

- Shim, Won Bo; and Park, Seog, "Implementing Web Access Control System for the

    Multiple Web Servers in the Same Domain Using RBAC Concept" disclosed a

    distributed web server based system that utilizes a role based access control method.

10.     Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Victor Lesniewski whose telephone number is 571-272-3987.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Victor Lesniewski
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2155


HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER